

REMARKS

Claims 1-30 are pending in this application. By this Amendment, claims 1-7, 10, 12, 14-16, 17-18, 20, 22, 25 and 27-30 are amended. Various amendments are made to the claims for clarity and are unrelated to issues of patentability.

Entry of the amendments is proper under 37 C.F.R. §1.116 because the amendments: (1) place the application in condition for allowance for the reasons set forth below; (2) do not raise any new issues requiring further search and/or consideration; and/or (3) place the application in better form for an appeal should an appeal be necessary. More specifically, the above amendments merely clarify features related to the claimed TV and/or television. No further search and/or consideration is necessary. Therefore, entry is proper under 37 C.F.R. § 1.116.

The Office Action rejects claims 1, 3-15 and 18-20 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over U.S. Patent 6,629,134 to Hayward et al. (hereafter Hayward) in view of U.S. Patent 6,505,243 to Lortz. The Office Action also rejects claims 2 and 22-26 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over Hayward, Lortz and further in view of U.S. Patent 6,757,837 to Platt et al. (hereafter Platt). Still further, the Office Action rejects claims 27-28 and 30 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over Hayward in view of Platt. Even further, the Office Action rejects claim 29 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over Hayward, Platt and further in view of Lortz. The Office Action rejects claim 16 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over Hayward, Lortz and further in view of the IBM Technical Disclosure Bulletin entitled "Real-Time Error Mapping of a Memory Basic Storage Module or System with No Performance Degradation to the System." Finally, the Office Action rejects claim 17 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a)

over Hayward, Lortz and further in view of JP06008594 to Kaneko. The rejections are respectfully traversed.

Independent claim 1 recites a TV comprising a storing unit for storing proper information of the TV, and contact information of a certain site. Independent claim 1 also recites a TV comprising a controlling unit for controlling displaying of information corresponding to function information and an error checkup menu of the TV received from the Internet based on the proper information of the TV and the contact information.

The applied references do not teach or suggest all the features of independent claim 1. More specifically, Hayward relates to a computer system having computer peripherals in which a peripheral condition may be determined and sent by firmware 16 over bus 32 to a computer 30. In addressing dependent claim 29, the Office Action agrees that Hayward (in combination with Platt) does not disclose a television in communication with a computer system. The Office Action then relies on Lortz as disclosing a system for providing support information about a device including a television coupled to a computer system. Applicants respectfully submit that Hayward in view of Lortz still does not teach or suggest all the features of independent claim 1. That is, Hayward is specifically related to a computer system that includes peripherals. Hayward does not disclose the claimed TV having the claimed features. Lortz discloses a network configuration that includes both traditional devices and non-traditional devices (such as TV 148 shown in Figure 2). At best, the combination of Hayward and Lortz merely discloses that a TV may be coupled to a network configuration. The combination does not teach or suggest a TV having the claimed storing unit and controlling unit.

More specifically, independent claim 1 recites a TV that includes a storing unit for storing proper information of the TV, and contact information of a certain site. The combination of Hayward and Lortz does not teach or suggest these features as there is no discussion regarding a TV having the claimed storing unit. Lortz's TV 148 does not include the claimed storing unit.

Additionally, independent claim 1 recites a TV including a controlling unit for controlling displaying of information corresponding to function information and an error checkup menu of the TV received from the Internet based on the proper information of the TV and the contact information. The combination of Hayward and Lortz does not teach or suggest these features as there is no discussion regarding a TV having the claimed controlling unit. Lortz's TV 148 does not include the claimed controlling unit. For at least the reasons set forth above, independent claim 1 defines patentable subject matter.

Independent claim 10 also defines patentable subject matter for at least similar reasons. That is, independent claim 10 recites a control method of a TV that includes transmitting proper information of the TV to a certain site, receiving service menu information corresponding to the TV as well as displaying the selected information on the screen of the TV. For at least the reasons set forth above, the applied references do not teach or suggest all the features of independent claim 10. Even more specifically, there is no suggestion for displaying the selected information on the screen of the TV. That is, Lortz's TV 148 does not display the claimed selected information. Thus, independent claim 10 defines patentable subject matter.

Independent claim 27 also defines patentable subject matter for at least similar reasons. That is, independent claim 27 recites a television that includes a storing unit to store information

of the television. Independent claim 27 also recites a television that includes a controlling unit to transmit the stored information and error information of the television to an Internet site, the controlling unit to receive error information based on the transmitted error information, and the controlling unit to automatically apply the received error information so as to restore the error of the television. For at least the reasons set forth above, the applied references do not teach or suggest these features. Additionally, Platt does not teach or suggest the missing features of independent claim 27. More specifically, Platt does not suggest to automatically apply the received error information so as to restore the error of the television. Platt does not relate to errors of a television. Thus, independent claim 27 defines patentable subject matter.

For at least the reasons set forth above, each of independent claims 1, 10 and 27 defines patentable subject matter. Each of the dependent claims depends from one of the independent claims and therefore defines patentable subject matter at least for this reason. In addition, the dependent claims recite features that further and independently distinguish over the applied references. For example, dependent claim 2 recites that the controlling unit automatically restores an error of the TV based on received information. See also dependent claims 22 and 25. For at least similar reasons as set forth above, the applied references do not teach or suggest these features. That is, Platt does not suggest to restore an error of the TV based on received information. Thus, dependent claim 2 (and similarly dependent claims 22 and 25) define patentable subject matter at least for these additional reasons.

Serial No. 09/842,082
Reply to Office Action dated September 7, 2005

Docket No. P-0222

CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that the application is in condition for allowance. Favorable consideration and prompt allowance of claims 1-30 are earnestly solicited. If the Examiner believes that any additional changes would place the application in better condition for allowance, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned attorney at the telephone number listed below.

To the extent necessary, a petition for an extension of time under 37 C.F.R. 1.136 is hereby made. Please charge any shortage in fees due in connection with the filing of this, concurrent and future replies, including extension of time fees, to Deposit Account 16-0607 and please credit any excess fees to such deposit account.

Respectfully submitted,
FLESHNER & KIM, LLP



David C. Oren
Registration No. 38,694

P.O. Box 221200
Chantilly, Virginia 20153-1200
(703) 766-3701 DYK:DCO/kah

Date: December 7, 2005

Please direct all correspondence to Customer No. 34610